UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,072	10/06/2003	Sridhar Srinivasan	3382-66954	9945

26119 7590 01/03/2012
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP
121 S.W. SALMON STREET
SUITE 1600
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER	
ANYIKIRE, CHIKAODILI E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2482	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/03/2012	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tanya.harding@klarquist.com
docketing@klarquist.com
valerie.sullivan@klarquist.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/680,072	Applicant(s) SRINIVASAN ET AL.	
	Examiner CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	Art Unit 2482	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 October 2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12,17-23,25,30,39,40,45,47,48,50-57,59-62,65 and 67* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12,17-23,25,30,39,40,45,47,48,50-57,59-62,65 and 67* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 28, 2011 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Acknowledgement is made of applicant's Information Disclosure Statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims **30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 30 recites a "computer readable medium" which appears to cover both transitory and non-transitory embodiments. See specification, page 13 lines 14 – page 14 lines 3, which gives examples of the readable medium to be ROM, RAM, CDs, hard discs**, etc**. The "etc" is broad and is open to many interpretations such as signal or software. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is required to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during proceeding before the USPTO. See *In re Zletz,* 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989)(during patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals *per se* in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent. See MPEP 2111.01.

When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal *per se*, the claim **must** be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter. See *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter) and *Interim Examination Instructions for Evaluating Subject Matter Eligibility* under 35 U.S.C. 101 Aug. 24 2009; p. 2.

The Examiner suggests that the Applicant add the limitation "non-transitory" to the computer readable medium as recited in the claim(s) in order to properly render the claim(s) in statutory form in view of their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the originally filed specification. The Examiner also suggests that the specification may be amended to include the term 'non-transitory computer readable medium" disclosed in the claims and specification to avoid a potential objection to the specification for a lack of antecedent basis of the claimed terminology.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 18-19, 21-23, 25, and 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hagai et al (US 2004/0032908, hereafter Hagai).

As per **claim 1**, Hagai discloses in a computer system, a computer-implemented method comprising:

receiving video data (paragraph [0003] lines 2-6, [0004] lines 7-9, and paragraph [0048] lines 1-4);

encoding (Figure 3; element 102 and 305) the video data (paragraph [0004] lines 8-20);

parameterizing control information other than the encoded video data (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10), including:

setting a filter type selection that identifies one or more of plural different types of filters for post-processing filtering, wherein the control information other than the encoded video data includes the filter type selection (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses the use of a filter type selection); and

setting filter information that varies depending on quality or bitrate of the encoded video data, wherein the control information other than the encoded video data further includes the filter information (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size): and wherein the filter information is different than the filter type selection (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value and a filter type element);

wherein the control information facilitates adjustment by a decoder of the post-processing filtering of the video data after decoding of the encoded video data (paragraph [0048] lines 18 - 27), the adjustment including:

using the filter type selection to identify the one or more types of filters (paragraph [0048] lines 18 - 27; Hagai discloses the filter type information “FilterType1” representing a filter A or a filter B); and

using the filter information to determine filter operations that are appropriate for the quality or bitrate of the encoded video data (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size), wherein the filter operations are for the identified one or more types of filters (paragraph [0048] lines 18 - 27; Hagai discloses the filter type information “FilterType1” representing a filter A or a filter B), and wherein, within settings defined by the control information for the post-processing filtering, the decoder can adjust the filter operations depending on processing cycles available to the decoder ; and outputting the encoded video data as well as the control information (paragraph [0048] lines 29-44).

As per **claim 2**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising:

receiving input that indicates the control information (paragraph [0048] lines 4 - 11).

As per **claim 3**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 2 wherein a video encoder receives the input (paragraph [0048] lines 4 - 11).

As per **claim 4**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 2 wherein an application receives the input and provides the control information to a video encoder (paragraph [0048] lines 4 - 11).

As per **claim 5**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 wherein a video encoder specifies the control information depending on one or more criteria, and wherein the one or more criteria include quantization step size and/or quality of the video data (paragraph [0048] lines 9-11).

As per **claim 6**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the post-processing filtering to be performed includes applying a de-blocking filter (paragraph [0046] lines 28-30).

As per **claim 8**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the filter information is parameterized as a level for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0046] lines 28 - 34).

As per **claim 9**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the filter information is parameterized as a maximum allowed level for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0049] lines 8-12 and 19-27; Hagai discloses the use of only two filters an inter pixel filter B corresponding to the maximum allowed level to the higher suppression effect and a higher processing load).

As per **claim 10**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the filter information is parameterized as a minimum allowed level for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0049] lines 8-12 and 19-27; Hagai discloses the use of only two filters an inter pixel filter A corresponding to the minimum allowed level to a lower processing load).

As per **claim 12**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising entropy encoding the control information (paragraph [0048] lines 34 - 40).

As per **claim 18**, Hagai discloses a computer-implemented method comprising:

receiving encoded video data in a bitstream as well as control information in the bitstream for controlling post-processing filtering, the control information comprising data in the bitstream other than the encoded video data, wherein the control information includes (paragraph [0064] lines 1-4):

a filter type selection that identifies one or more of plural different types of filters for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0065] lines 7-20); and

filter information that varies depending on quality or bitrate of the encoded video data, wherein the filter information is different than the filter type selection (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size);

decoding the encoded video data (paragraph [0065] lines 4-7);

determining available processing cycles (paragraph [0049] lines 19-33); and

adjusting the post-processing filtering on the decoded video data, the adjustment including using the filter information to determine filter operations that are appropriate for the quality or bitrate of the encoded video data, wherein the filter operations are for the one or more types of filters identified with the filter type selection, and wherein, within settings defined by the control information for the post-processing filtering, the decoder can adjust the filter operations depending on the processing cycles available to the decoder (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10, [0049] lines 19-33, [0054], and [0067]; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size).

Regarding **claim 19**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6 are applicable for claim 19.

Regarding **claim 21**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 8 are applicable for claim 21.

Regarding **claim 22**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 9 are applicable for claim 22.

Regarding **claim 23**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 10 are applicable for claim 23.

As per **claim 25**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 18 further comprising entropy decoding the control information (paragraph [0065] lines 1-10).

As per **claim 48**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 18, further comprising performing the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0065] lines 12-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 7 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagai et al (US 2004/00332908, hereafter Hagai) in view of Park et al (US 2003/0219074, hereafter Park).

As per **claim 7**, Hagai discloses the method of claim 1.

However, Hagai does not explicitly teach wherein the post-processing filtering to be performed includes applying a de-ringing filter.

In the same field of endeavor, Park discloses wherein the post-processing filtering to be performed includes applying a de-ringing filter (paragraph [0059] lines 3-5 and [0060] lines 9-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai in view of Park. The advantage is the removal of ringing noise to improve the image quality.

Regarding **claim 20**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7 are applicable for claim 20.

8. Claims 17, 30, 39-40, 45, 47, 50-57, 59-62, 65 and 67 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagai et al (US 2004/0032908, hereafter Hagai).

As per **claim 17**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses in a computing device that implements a video encoder, a method comprising:

at the computing device that implements the video encoder, receiving video data (paragraph [0003] lines 2-6, [0004] lines 7-9, and paragraph [0048] lines 1-4);

with the computing device that implements the video encoder, encoding the video data (Figure 3; element 102 and 305) the video data (paragraph [0004] lines 8-20);

with the computing device that implements the video encoder, parameterizing control information other than the encoded video data (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10), including:

setting a filter type selection that identifies one or more of plural different types of filters for post-processing filtering, wherein the control information other than the encoded video data includes the filter type selection (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses the use of a filter type selection); and

setting filter information that varies depending on quality or bitrate of the encoded video data, wherein the control information other than the encoded video data further includes the filter information, and wherein the filter information is different than the filter type selection (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size);

wherein the control information facilitates adjustment by a decoder of the post-processing filtering of the video data after decoding, the adjustment including using the filter information to determine filter operations that are appropriate for the quality or bitrate of the encoded video data (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size), wherein the filter operations are for the one or more types of filters (paragraph [0048] lines 18 - 27; Hagai discloses the filter type information “FilterType1” representing a filter A or a filter B);

identified with the filter type selection, wherein, within settings defined by the control information for the post-processing filtering, the decoder can adjust the filter operations depending on processing power available to the decoder (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10 and [0054]; Hagai discloses the use of a filter type selection and discloses dependency on processing capability), wherein, and

with the computing device that implements the video encoder, outputting the encoded video data as well as the control information (paragraph [0048] lines 29-44).

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach when the filter information indicates lower quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to enable the post-processing filtering, and wherein, when the filter information indicates higher quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to disable the post-processing filtering.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment teaches when the filter information indicates lower quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to enable the post-processing filtering, and wherein, when the filter information indicates higher quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to disable the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0109]; Hagai explains that their is a ON/OFF switch and that a test is performed to determine the quality which executes the processing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

As per **claim 30**, Hagai discloses a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions for causing a computer system to perform a computer-implemented method comprising:

receiving encoded video data in a bitstream as well as control information in the bitstream for controlling post-processing filtering, the control information comprising data in the bitstream other than the encoded video data, wherein the control information includes (paragraph [0064] lines 1-4):

a filter type selection that identifies one or more of plural different types of filters for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0065] lines 7-20); and

filter information that varies depending on quality or bitrate of the encoded video data, wherein the filter information is different than the filter type selection (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size);

decoding the encoded video data (paragraph [0065] lines 4-7);

using the filter type selection to select one or more of plural different types of filters for post-processing filtering (paragraph [0065] lines 7-20);

determining available processing power (paragraph [0049] lines 19-33); and

adjusting the post-processing filtering on the decoded, video data, including using the filter information to determine filter operations that are appropriate for the quality or bitrate of the encoded video data, wherein the filter operations are for the selected one or more types of filters (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10, [0049] lines 19-33, [0054], and [0067]; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size).

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach and wherein, within settings defined by the control information for the post-processing filtering, the decoder can adjust the filter operations depending on the processing power available to the decoder, wherein, when the filter information indicates lower quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to enable the post-processing filtering, and wherein, when the filter information indicates higher quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to disable the post- processing filtering.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment discloses and wherein, within settings defined by the control information for the post-processing filtering, the decoder can adjust the filter operations depending on the processing power available to the decoder, wherein, when the filter information indicates lower quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to enable the post-processing filtering, and wherein, when the filter information indicates higher quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to disable the post- processing filtering (paragraph [0109]; Hagai explains that their is a

ON/OFF switch and that a test is performed to determine the quality which executes the processing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

As per **claim 39**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 1.

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach wherein the adjustment of post-processing filtering to be performed comprises skipping the post-processing filtering for at least some of the video data.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment teaches wherein the adjustment of post-processing filtering to be performed comprises skipping the post-processing filtering for at least some of the video data (paragraph [0109]; Hagai explains that their is a ON/OFF switch and that a test is performed to determine the quality which executes the processing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

As per **claim 40**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 1.

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach wherein the control information specifies that the decoder should skip the post-processing filtering.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment teaches wherein the control information specifies that the decoder should skip the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0109]; Hagai explains that their is a ON/OFF switch and that a test is performed to determine the quality which executes the processing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

As per **claim 45**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 1.

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach wherein the control information further comprises:

information indicating whether or not the post-processing filtering is to be performed after decoding; and

for each of plural pictures represented in the video data, if the post-processing filtering is to be performed for the picture, information indicating the filter type selection for the post- processing filtering for the picture.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment discloses wherein the control information further comprises:

information indicating whether or not the post-processing filtering is to be performed after decoding; and for each of plural pictures represented in the video data, if the post-processing filtering is to be performed for the picture, information indicating the filter type selection for the post- processing filtering for the picture (paragraph

[0109]; Hagai explains that their is a ON/OFF switch and that a test is performed to determine the quality which executes the processing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

As per **claim 47**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 18.

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach, wherein determining available processing cycles comprises determining available CPU cycles for applying post-processing filtering.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment discloses wherein determining available processing cycles comprises determining available CPU cycles for applying post-processing filtering (paragraph [0117]-[0118]; Hagai discloses that the system function based on the CPU operation rate which is equivalent to the available CPU cycles).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

Regarding **claim 50**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 45 are applicable for claim 50.

Regarding **claim 51**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 45 are applicable for claim 51.

As per **claim 52**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 51, wherein the parsing the control information further comprises, for each of the plural pictures represented in the video data, if the post-processing filtering is to be performed for the picture, parsing information indicating the filter type selection for the post-processing filtering for the picture (paragraph [0065] lines 7-20).

As per **claim 53**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 17 wherein a video encoder specifies the control information depending on one or more criteria, and wherein the one or more criteria include quantization step size and/or quality of the video data (paragraph [0048] lines 4-10; Hagai discloses a value that reflects the bit rate (compression rate) or a picture size).

As per **claim 54**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 17 wherein the post-processing filtering to be performed includes applying a de-blocking filter or a de-ringing filter (paragraph [0046] lines 28-34).

As per **claim 55**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 17 wherein the filter information is parameterized as a level for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0046] lines 28 - 34).

As per **claim 56**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 17 wherein the filter information is parameterized as a maximum allowed level or a minimum allowed level for the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0049] lines 8-12 and 19-27; Hagai discloses the use of only two filters an inter pixel filter B corresponding to the maximum allowed level to the higher suppression effect and a higher processing load).

Regarding **claim 57**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 45 are applicable for claim 57.

Regarding **claim 59**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 54 are applicable for claim 59.

Regarding **claim 60**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 55 are applicable for claim 60.

Regarding **claim 61**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 56 are applicable for claim 61.

Regarding **claim 62**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 47 are applicable for claim 62.

As per **claim 65**, Hagai of the First Embodiment discloses the method of claim 1.

However, Hagai of the First Embodiment does not explicitly teach wherein, when the filter information indicates lower quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to enable the post-processing filtering, and wherein, when the filter information indicates higher quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to disable the post-processing filtering.

In the same field of endeavor, Hagai of the Third Embodiment discloses wherein, when the filter information indicates lower quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to enable the post-processing filtering, and wherein, when the filter information indicates higher quality or bitrate, the filter information tends to disable the post-processing filtering (paragraph [0109]; Hagai explains that their is a ON/OFF switch and that a test is performed to determine the quality which executes the processing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Hagai of the First Embodiment in view of Hagai of the Third Embodiment. The advantage of Hagai of the Third Embodiment generates a decoded picture without block distortion.

Regarding **claim 67**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 65 are applicable for claim 67.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272 - 7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHIKAODILI E ANYIKIRE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2482